

### **Remarks**

This supplemental response has been filed to address the Double-Patenting Rejection raised in the Office Action dated 07-May-2009. Applicants rely on their Amendment and Response filed 04-Sept-2009, incorporated herein by reference, to address all other issues raised in the office action.

### **Double-Patenting**

Claim 1 stands rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 3-11 of U.S. Patent No. 6,660,354.

Claim 6 stands rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 12 of U.S. Patent No. 6,660,354.

WO01/64805, the PCT publication corresponding to U.S. Patent No. 6,660,354, was cited in the specification of the present application. (See, e.g., Paragraphs [0004] – [0005].) Claims 1 and 6 differ from the cited claims at least because claims 1 and 6 require “an acrylic release agent precursor comprising a poly(meth)acrylate ester having a group that generates a free radical in the release agent precursor by irradiation with ultraviolet radiation.”

Examples 1-4 and Comparative Example 1 demonstrate the benefits associated with including “an acrylic release agent precursor comprising a poly(meth)acrylate ester having a group that generates a free radical in the release agent precursor by irradiation with ultraviolet radiation,” as compared to an identical sample prepared without such an ester.

Examples 5-8 and Comparative Examples 2 and 3 demonstrate the surprising improvement obtained when the release agent precursor comprises a poly(meth)acrylate ester having a group that generates a free radical in the release agent precursor by irradiation with ultraviolet radiation (e.g., 4-acryloyloxybenzophenone (ABP)) as compared to similar samples prepared by adding a free radical generating material (i.e., benzophenone (BP)) as a separate component rather than as part of a poly(meth)acrylate ester.

Applicants respectfully submit that the Patent Office has failed to show how U.S. Patent No. 6,660,354 describes, teaches, suggests, or otherwise renders claims 1 and 6 obvious. For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the double-patenting rejection of claims 1 and 6, and allowance of all pending claims.

With this response, an earnest effort has been made to respond to all issues raised in the Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment. In view of the above, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance and reconsideration of the application is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

January 18, 2010

Date

By: /Thomas M. Spielbauer/

Thomas M. Spielbauer, Reg. No.: 58,492

Telephone No.: 651-736-9814

Office of Intellectual Property Counsel  
3M Innovative Properties Company  
Facsimile No.: 651-736-3833